

July 21, 1998

To readers of California's Unified State Plan for Community Service, Service Learning, and Volunteerism:

As you will discover from reading the attached paper, there exists a plan for unifying the efforts of Californians dedicated to advancing community service, service learning, and volunteerism. It is actually only accurate to say that California has the beginnings of this plan. Because it is just a beginning, California's Unified State Plan leaves many questions unanswered. For instance, the plan begins to provide a broad overview of California needs and assets but does not attempt to identify community service priorities. Also, the plan does a better job at speaking to how national service programs can work together and a much lesser job at articulating a common agenda for the entire service field. Unifying the nine national service programs, born over the span of 34 years, operating in hundreds of California communities, is no small goal. However, those involved in the planning process have always aspired to a plan that describes a vision and set of action steps compelling to the broadest possible spectrum of service advocates.

The attached plan is the product of a year long process that involved many of the state's leaders including representatives of: the commercial, independent, and public sectors; advocates of senior, young adult, and youth service; organizations focused statewide, regionally, and locally; and national service programs including school-age and higher education service-learning, AmeriCorps, VISTA, NCCC, and the National Senior Service Corps. Indications of the plan's potential surfaced as participating members embarked during the planning process on joint ventures, including a high impact America Reads statewide initiative, driven simply by the idea of unifying. At the same time, the difficulties of finding common ground and strengthening ties through a planning process, as compared to more action-oriented cooperative efforts, proved substantial. As a result, designing an ongoing collaboration building process focused on joint ventures, such as joint training or resource development, has been considered by some as a possibly more productive way to continue the unified planning process.

Building the unified state planning process into one that energizes the power of the service field around common goals will require time and effort. If you would like to contribute please contact the Commission at (916) 323-7646. On behalf of Commission Chairman Todd Clark, Wade Brynson from the California Department of Education, and Mae Chao from the Corporation for National Service State Office, I thank all of you who have contributed thus far to the plan's development and encourage all of you to join us as we revisit our Unified State Plan this year!

Sincerely,

Dr. Linda Forsyth,
Executive Director

California's 1998 Unified State Plan for Community Service, Service-Learning, and Volunteerism

Preface

*“Life’s most persistent
and urgent question is:
What are you doing for
others?”*

-Martin Luther King, Jr.

From the onset it has been the intent of this plan to articulate a vision and set of action steps compelling to the broadest spectrum of individuals and organizations who, at their core, are driven by an ethic of service to others. The idea of a “*unified state plan*” was first proposed by the Corporation for National Service as a way to encourage collaboration among the public entities in each state with lead responsibility for national service programs. In California, these organizations, the Commission on Improving Life Through Service, the Corporation for National Service State Office, and the California Department of Education’s CalServe Initiative, have a history of increasingly ambitious collaborative work and of assuming a catalytic role for both their organizations and their programs in advancing the service field. Consistent with this catalytic role, these organizations have pursued the development of a plan broad in scope and that seeks to advance the full “continuum” of community service, volunteerism, and service-learning activities within California.

This first year of planning has surfaced many issues from which common ground and collective action will be charted and agreed upon as the planning process continues. The landscape of issues has many owners including:

- the commercial, independent, and public (governmental) sectors;
- advocates of community service and service-learning;

“ . . . strong communities are basically places where the capacities of local residents are identified, valued, and used. Weak communities are places that fail, for whatever reason, to mobilize the skills, capacities, and talents of their residents or members. ”

-John P. Kretzmann &
John L. McKnight

- service programs of seniors, young adults, and children and youth;
- organizations focused locally, regionally, and statewide and based in very distant and different urban, suburban, and rural communities;
- those who value the act of serving as good in and of itself and those who value service as a uniquely effective strategy for getting things done;
- national service programs, some of which were born three decades apart: VISTA, Retired & Senior Volunteer Program, Foster Grandparents, Senior Companions Program, AmeriCorps, and Learn & Serve America.

Adding to this complexity are the interests of those who have growing expectations of the role that service and volunteerism will take on to address needs, such as those related to welfare reform, that exceed the capacity and resources of traditional approaches. Despite this complexity, the planning process continues to aspire to its original broad scope.

Even without a “*unified state plan*,” significant unified action has occurred at the local, regional, and state levels. A few examples from the past year include:

- The Regional Service Networks, which received a great deal of attention this past year from the Commission, State Corporation Office, CalServe, Volunteer Centers of California, California Campus Compact, California Community Colleges, and Youth Service California.
- The fourth annual Service and Volunteerism Conference – a joint venture of the Commission, CalServe, Volunteer Centers of California, Youth Service California, Service Learning 2000 Center, and the California Conservation Corps (most recently held in Burbank in October, 1997).

“We think how dependent the public is on government – how much we need government. But what we may lose sight of is how much good government needs a good public.”

– David Matthews

- The biweekly *National Service Update*, an annual state program directory, and a new public service announcement that represents all CNS supported programs.
- A state-level America Reads Challenge collaboration of funders and supporters that includes the Commission, California Department of Education, State Corporation Office, California Education Roundtable, Steering Committee of America Reads College Presidents, and Region IX of the US Department of Education.
- A Commission and State Corporation Office joint initiative, *“Building Individual and Community Self Sufficiency Through Service,”* that included a new 718-member, 17-site statewide project led by the California Community Colleges.

The past year has also been an active year of statewide collaborative planning with forums convened, dialogue occurring, and input arriving from throughout the state. The 1998 Program Development, Assistance and Training (PDAT) plan was created, for the first time, with input from a Commission-sponsored survey of lead national service agencies and regional infrastructure partners. PDAT describes and helps to fund specific joint enterprises, including: cross stream training, Presidents' Summit follow-up, collaborative infrastructure building, America Reads joint implementation, continuing development of this Unified State Plan, and filling gaps in “stream”-specific program support budgets.

In terms of progress made, this past year of unified state planning, however, has not reached the level of specificity of the more focused PDAT plan, nor has it produced the tangible products of last year's unified work. It is likely more than coincidental that this unified state planning process, and a separate statewide public policy initiative for service and volunteerism launched under the leadership of the James Irvine Foundation, have encountered similar challenges in attempting to discover the highest common ground.

From this past year, we have learned that when focused on work and the production of tangible products, collaborations are built and strengthened more “naturally,” despite often large individual differences. In contrast, building and broadening collaboration through a planning process has proven more difficult and time demanding.

California will continue to place a premium on working together on needed, tangible projects. At the same time, California will actively continue planning, aware that adequate time and a thoughtful process will be necessary to overcome inherent differences in forging an agenda of collective action, particularly when we inhabit such distinct and geographically distant communities.

Unified State Plan Development

In essence, California's plan is an input-based document with input provided by three "tiers" of individuals. Each successive "tier" is composed of a broader membership than the previous one. The first formal meeting of "tier 1" took place on April 14, 1997 and brought together thirteen individuals representing national service programs, higher education, corporate volunteers, and volunteer centers to plan and schedule the development process. The plan's course was set by this group during this, and a subsequent follow-up meeting on May 7, 1997. That course included a commitment to bringing together a large and representative body as "full partners" to develop a plan built around commonly-held "broad themes" and fully incorporating local community input. Resources and challenges to the planning process were assessed by "tier 1" prior to the appointment of a writing team charged with producing the first draft of this plan.

After completion and distribution of the first draft, a group of twenty-five individuals, "tier 2", was convened on June 10, 1997 to provide comments and feedback. Based upon this feedback, a second draft was created and circulated throughout the state through California's regional network infrastructure. From September 1997 through January 1998 input meetings were held and input collected from this "tier 3" group of local service organizations and leaders from throughout the state. In addition, feedback was received in October 1997 from participants of the Service and Volunteerism Conference, all of whom received a copy of the plan, as well as from individuals accessing the plan through the Commission's website.

While the primary purpose of the first two drafts was to provide a framework for input and discussion, the aim of the third draft was to reflect the diverse views gathered through the planning process.

The third draft was circulated to Commissioners, members of the newly developed State Network Leadership Team, and the group of twenty-five who provided input on the first draft. These comments were incorporated into this version, which was formally adopted by the Executive and Policy Committee of the Commission for submission to the Corporation for National Service.

Introduction

Given the complex landscape of issues, the difficulties in finding common ground through a public planning process, and the scale of the task relative to available resources, why proceed with development of a Unified State Plan? Despite these challenges, no processes have been identified to date that would better accomplish the following:

- ◆ discovering and describing a higher common ground; one bound by a common set of beliefs to the service field – a common vision, values, and operating principles;
- ◆ identifying strengths, weaknesses, needs, and capabilities of each party within the service field and of the service field in its entirety;
- ◆ identifying opportunities and threats within, and external to the service field;
- ◆ identifying the interests, roles and responsibilities of each party;
- ◆ providing an opportunity to engage a broad service constituency in purposeful dialogue and the shaping and advancement of the bigger picture;
- ◆ planning needed actions, collectively when appropriate, including public policy initiatives;
- ◆ identifying a set of common priorities based on the needs of California;
- ◆ coordinating the efforts of the national service programs – AmeriCorps, VISTA, service-learning, and the three National Senior Service Corps – and support for these programs.

In this document, California presents the following:

- A draft set of governing ideas: vision statement, core values, and operating principles that can be used as a starting point to guide the ongoing planning process that will include the original partners and enroll additional organizations.
- A “*snapshot*” of California which summarizes the pressing social and environmental realities and provides a context to be used as a basis to define future priorities.
- A one-year action plan divided into nine objectives, including five drawn from California's 1998 PDAT plan. Objectives drawn from the PDAT plan focus on support to national service programs to be provided collaboratively by the three lead state agencies for national service. The remaining objectives are focused more broadly and include collective action on infrastructure development, public policy, outreach, Presidents' Summit follow-up, and continuing development of this Unified State Plan.

Vision

This plan envisions a California where:

- All Californians choose to serve their communities;
- Californians of all ages and from all communities have the opportunity to serve and receive the support they need to make a real difference through their contributions;
- Service in all its forms, from occasional volunteering to full-time service, is a widely understood and employed strategy that meets critical local needs through engagement of community members and other assets to build communities from within;
- The experience of serving is widely recognized as a developer of better individuals, workers, students, an active and informed citizenry, and a potent unifier of a diverse society;

- There is broad, multi-sector support and strong collaboration at all levels that leads to efficient expansion of service opportunities and impacts.
-

Values & Operating Principles

In pursuit of this vision, what will those pledged to this plan hold as important?

- Collaborations will be based on the same democratic principles that underlie service itself: equality and participation. Collaborations will seek a balance that allows for the degree of independence needed to maximize benefits to local communities and allow for necessary checks and balances between sectors, while providing the degree of unity needed for advocacy and other actions best taken collectively.
- All forms of service prompted by a voluntary impulse to serve will be supported, from full-time, stipended service to occasional volunteering, from children engaged in service-learning to senior service, and efforts sponsored by all sectors, including business, government, not-for-profit organizations, and faith-based charities;
- Grassroots as well as collective action taken under this plan will strengthen local communities and promote the plan's shared vision;
- The full participation in the advancement of service of all sectors - public, private, and independent - is necessary to the promotion of service and citizenship in a democratic republic;
- Priorities will be determined based on needs, including those needs that are shaped by forces unique to individual communities and systemic forces that affect multiple communities;
- Californians who commit their service and money, or other forms of support, deserve service opportunities structured to make a real difference with training, supervision, support, clear objectives, and accountability systems designed to achieve tangible results;
- Local community members and institutions are responsible for forming collaborations, identifying needs and assets, designing solutions, and providing service;
- State/regional public organizations are responsible for respecting local needs and plans, providing resources in support of locally crafted collaborative initiatives, and working with other grantmakers and public organizations to streamline access to a range of potential resources;
- Programs should be developed in a manner that leverages existing resources, encourages local flexibility and accountability, includes participant reflection on their respective experiences, provides recognition to participants, and encourages regular evaluation as a continuous improvement strategy.

A Snapshot of California

To meet our future vision of California, it is important to understand where we currently stand. The following statistics are meant to provide a context of the social and other realities currently facing California:

- It is projected that by the year 2025, 49.3 million people will live in California.¹
- By 2025, California will be home to one in five of the nation's children.²
- Twenty-five percent of California's children currently live in poverty, a 2.7 percent increase over 1990.³
- In 1996, 57 percent of California's five-year olds had been fully immunized against childhood diseases by the age of two.⁴
- 1996 marked the sixth straight year of declining births throughout the state. The teen birth rate continues to drop among all ethnicities.⁵
- The number of Californians over age 60 will more than double by the year 2020.⁶
- California's dependency ratio is expected to rise from 70.6 in 1995 to 83.5 in 2025. The dependency ratio represents the ratio of youth (under age 20) and elderly (ages 65 and over) for every 100 people of working age (20 to 64 years of age).⁷
- The number of families receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) has dropped 10 percent from January 1993 to September 1997.⁸
- Although juveniles account for fewer total arrests than adults, juvenile felony arrests continue to remain higher than adults. Projections for the year 2004 show the number of these arrests growing by more than 29 percent.⁹
- The number of prison inmates has grown more rapidly (161 percent) than any other caseload group (AFDC and Medi-Cal recipients, K-12 and higher education) in the last decade.¹⁰
- In 1997, California's total economy surpassed one trillion dollars, making it the seventh largest economy in the world. In addition, 335,000 jobs were added in 1997, representing a growth rate of 2.6 percent.¹¹

¹ U.S. Census Bureau, 1995

² "California Report Card 97", Children Now

³ "California Report Card 97", Children Now

⁴ 1998-99 California Governor's Budget Summary

⁵ California Department of Health Services, 1997

⁶ U.S. Census Bureau, 1995

⁷ U.S. Census Bureau, 1995

⁸ California Department of Social Services, 1997

⁹ Cal Facts, Legislative Analyst's Office, 1996

¹⁰ Cal Facts, Legislative Analyst's Office, 1996

¹¹ 1998-99 California Governor's Budget Summary

- It is useful to realize that the independent sector is much smaller than the government and commercial sectors. In terms of national income, commerce totals 79 percent, government is 15 percent, and the whole of the independent sector is only 6 percent. . . Nonprofit groups spend approximately \$250 billion a year, as contrasted with the combined expenditures of the three levels of government, which comes to about \$2.5 trillion. . . It should also be noted that approximately one third of the income of the nonprofits comes from governmental allocations.¹²
- The infrastructure to support the recent increase in demand for volunteer activities is insufficient. Problems include: program models and training programs are not widely shared, statewide efforts (both public and private) are not well coordinated, many community institutions do not have the capacity to put volunteers to work effectively, many organizations do not organize opportunities that meet the needs/interests of the volunteer, and many organizations feel that organizing and relying on volunteers is too hard, too time consuming, and is too much trouble.¹³
- All of private foundation giving in the United States amounts to three tenths of one percent of the federal budget.¹⁴
- The level of funding for regional networks should match the level of expectations set forth in mini-grants. The scope of expected work should be clearly defined and appropriate funding should follow.¹⁵

Action Plan

Objective 1

Support the development of a strong and responsive *infrastructure* for service activities within California.

- 1.1 The national service partners (Commission, State Corporation Office, CalServe), working collaboratively with California Campus Compact, Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, Volunteer Centers of California, and Youth Service California, will form a State Network Leadership Team (SNLT) to guide the development of a regional infrastructure system. The State Network Leadership Team has agreed to a goal statement to guide its work and the first steps to identify and train regional leadership teams in up to twenty regions. The SNLT has committed to:
- meet on a regular basis
 - identify potential partners and/or members of the SNLT
 - identify geographic boundaries for regional network activities
 - coordinate local assistance funding and in-kind resources for use at the regional level
 - clarify the functions and characteristics of regional networks necessary to access funding
 - develop a training event for all regional network leadership teams
 - seek additional resources to support efforts at the local level
 - recommend grant funding allocations to regional networks

¹² O'Connell, Brian, People Power: Service, Advocacy, Empowerment, 1994

¹³ The James Irvine Foundation, 1998

¹⁴ Susan Packard Orr, President of the Packard Foundation, 1997

¹⁵ Evaluation of the California Regional Networks, 1997

- 1.2 Regional leadership teams will be created to advance service in their respective communities. Regional leadership teams will, at a minimum:
- include local representatives of the SNLT organizations
 - conduct outreach to potential regional network members
 - produce a regional asset and needs assessment
 - convene regular regional network meetings
 - develop a basic communication strategy, such as a newsletter, to relay vital information and promote service opportunities
 - forge partnerships that provide mutual assistance and training opportunities to regional network participants
 - serve as a point of entry and advocate for service activities within their region
- 1.3 The national service partners will map services provided by their respective programs, in an effort to alleviate duplication of services provided and to promote collaborative programming.
- 1.3.a The national service partners will organize meetings in various cities to encourage cross-stream communication and ease the challenge of mapping services in metropolitan areas.

Objective 2

Provide ***cross-stream training*** to adequately address statewide training and technical assistance needs.

- 2.1 The California Training and Technical Assistance Center (CTTAC) and the services it provides will be available to all CNS-funded programs within California.
- 2.1.a The national service partners will inform CTTAC of their respective training opportunities and providers that may be of value to other programs.
- 2.1.b SNLT members will provide CTTAC with listings of their training and technical assistance services.
- 2.2 The annual National Service Program Training conference, held in August, will be expanded to include participants from all streams of service.
- 2.2.a Representatives from the CNS State Office will join the conference planning team.
- 2.2.b Additional tracks will be added to the existing conference plan to further emphasize cross-stream training, including:
- community building and collaboration training
 - service-learning training
 - volunteer generation and support training
 - outcome based programming and evaluation
- 2.2.c Funding from the 1998 PDAT grant will be used to support travel costs of CNS State Office programs to assure their participation in the conference.
- 2.3 Program staff from all national service partners will participate in a cross-stream training to provide adequate understanding of the objectives and operating procedures of each stream of national service.

Objective 3

Develop *joint enterprises* and programs that demonstrate the effectiveness of service as a strategy to meet societal needs.

- 3.1 The national service partners will engage in developing a comprehensive America Reads initiative to address the needs of California's children.
 - 3.1.a A joint request for applications (RFA) will be issued.
 - 3.1.b Outreach and technical assistance will be provided in a collaborative manner.
 - 3.1.c The viability of collaborative evaluation methods, including joint site visits among program officers, will be considered.
- 3.2 The national service partners will identify other issue areas on which statewide service initiatives can be built.
- 3.3 The national service partners will develop strategies and incentives to encourage the development of program models that demonstrate the following:
 - 3.3.a Actively seek programmatic collaborations with CNS programs and others to assure the strategic use of CNS resources.
 - 3.3.b Apply standards to programs which:
 - Integrate service-learning for service givers into all service activities
 - Address locally identified priorities
 - Require involvement of local community partners.
 - 3.3.c Engage in regular evaluation of the impact of projects and services and in continuous quality improvement.
 - 3.3.d Focus on giving particular service to those communities that are underserved.
 - 3.3.e Focus on generating service that addresses those societal problems that have widespread and severe impact on the fabric and resources of California communities.
 - 3.3.f Support state initiatives to address gaps in service and communities served.
 - 3.3.g Facilitate training, peer exchanges, and technical assistance to promote and support continuous improvement efforts.
 - 3.3.h Share technical assistance and training on outcome programming and evaluation.
- 3.4 The national service partners will consult with one another regarding the priorities outlined in their respective planning mechanisms, in an effort to assure the strategic use of CNS resources in funded collaborations and partnerships.

Objective 4

Use appropriate *public policy* mechanisms to increase the efficacy of service activities within California.

- 4.1 The national service partners will identify state and local regulations that serve as barriers to service activities.

- 4.1.a CNS-funded programs and regional network participants will be surveyed to determine particular areas of concerns, beyond those already identified, including liability and risk management of volunteers.
 - 4.1.b Working with state policymakers, the national service partners will seek statutory action to alleviate barriers.
 - 4.1.c As appropriate, the national service partners will work with other administrative entities within the state to alleviate barriers.
- 4.2 A cross-stream plan to inform policymakers of the activities of all national service programs within their districts will be developed.
 - 4.2.a All members of the California legislature and the California congressional delegation will continue to receive copies of the biweekly *National Service Update*.
 - 4.2.b A survey of all CNS-funded programs will be conducted to determine state assembly and senate districts, as well as congressional districts.
 - 4.2.c A comprehensive information packet, including all national service program sites within a given district, will be compiled and forwarded to policymakers.
 - 4.2.d Policymakers will be invited to visit national service program sites within their respective districts.
- 4.3 The national service partners will track legislation introduced by lawmakers as a means to include service as strategy in proposed legislation.
- 4.4 The national service partners will identify other state entities that operate program models that could be enhanced by including service as a strategy in meeting their objectives.

Objective 5

Increase **public awareness** of CNS-funded programs.

- 5.1 An annual national service program public awareness/recruitment strategy will be developed to include all the national service partners.
 - 5.1.a Each national service partner will inventory/assess the current public relations activities of their offices and programs and participate in the development of a common strategy.
 - 5.1.b Funds from the 1998 PDAT grant will augment the existing *National Service Update* with articles and special inserts on all national service programs within the state. Particular emphasis will be placed on collaborative programs, as appropriate.

- 5.1.c The national service partners will develop common joint outreach strategies including:
 - streams of service public service announcement
 - streams of service brochure, including translation into non-English languages
 - common talking points for outreach to community entities
- 5.2 CNS-funded programs will evaluate their current public awareness and outreach activities and define steps to increase the impact of such activities.
 - 5.2.a Media training will be provided to CNS-funded programs at the National Service Program Training, and elsewhere as necessary.
 - 5.2.b Support will be provided to programs with specific media needs.

Objective 6

Develop multi-sector support to expand the *sustainability* of service activities within California.

- 6.1 The national service partners will assess their resource needs and develop a collaborative strategy to increase public, foundation, and business support for infrastructure.
 - 6.1.a National service partners will be surveyed to determine their relationships with foundations and businesses in California.
 - 6.1.b The national service partners will actively pursue funding to support innovative programs in the field, to develop a strong statewide infrastructure, and to further advance the fields of service, volunteerism, and community involvement.
 - 6.1.c The national service partners will devise a strategy to increase the number of and emphasis placed on developing public-private partnerships.
 - 6.1.d All corporate solicitations made by the national service partners will include a request for employee involvement, in addition to monetary and/or in-kind support.
- 6.2 The national service partners will assist their respective programs in increasing public, foundation, and business support for match, sustainability, and expansion purposes.
 - 6.2.a Conduct a statewide needs assessment to determine the level of training needed in basic fundraising strategies and techniques.
 - 6.2.b Provide appropriate training strands at the National Service Program Training in August.
 - 6.2.c Provide assistance and counsel to those programs that pursue financial support from private sources.

Objective 7

Strengthen California's efforts to achieve *Presidents' Summit* goals, with particular emphasis on Goal 5¹⁶.

- 7.1 Working with the Summit cities, the national service partners will determine ways in which CNS-funded programs can support the plans of the Summit cities.
 - 7.1.a Representatives from Summit cities will be invited to attend and participate in CNS-sponsored trainings.
 - 7.1.b The viability of attaining monetary and in-kind resources, in addition to the 1998 PDAT mini-grant fund, will be determined.
- 7.2 The national service partners will encourage Summit city representatives to participate in regional network activities.
- 7.3 The national service partners will work with Summit city representatives to increase service opportunities for youth, as outlined in Summit Goal 5.
- 7.4 The national service partners will offer Summit city youth delegates the opportunity for leadership training, and provide assistance in connecting youth to national service programs and regional network activities that advance key Summit city goals.

Objective 8

Increase *civic participation* and understanding through service activities.

- 8.1 The national service partners will work collaboratively to identify methods to help the California Department of Education attain its goal that 25 percent of school districts in California will include community service or service learning instructional strategies at each of the three grade spans – elementary, middle, and high by the year 2000 and that 50 percent of school districts will include service-learning by 2004.
- 8.2 National service partners will continue to engage representatives from businesses/corporations; higher education; state and local government; and membership associations to expand the base of volunteers within California.
- 8.3 Through public awareness activities, Californians will show a greater interest in volunteer and service activities, generating a greater number of volunteers throughout the state.

Objective 9

Provide ongoing *Unified State Plan* development to encourage collaboration and coordinate service efforts.

- 9.1 The Statewide Planning Committee will be expanded and charged as the Unified State Plan Committee to provide ongoing support and oversight of the implementation process.
 - 9.1.a Committee members will be identified and meet at least twice per year.
 - 9.1.b Committee members will provide leadership in ensuring the year one objectives are addressed by the entities charged with responsibility for each objective or action step.

¹⁶ Goal 5 – An Opportunity for Young People to Give Back Through Their Own Service

- 9.1.c The national service partners will provide staff leadership in ensuring that the plan is disseminated and implemented.
 - 9.1.d The committee will determine the need for and strategies to evaluate the year-one plan.
 - 9.2 The Unified State Plan Committee will provide leadership in developing the year-two plan.
 - 9.2.a The committee will develop a comprehensive outreach effort to facilitate input on attainable action steps for year two.
 - 9.2.b Based on input received, the committee will make recommendations for year two action steps.
 - 9.2.c The committee will ensure that appropriate aspects of future stream specific national service plans are incorporated into the year-two plan.
 - 9.2.d The committee will develop, in concert, with input provided by others, long term objectives for the plan and standards by which to assess the success of those objectives.
 - 9.2.e The committee will outline continuous improvement efforts for incorporation into future years' plans, and facilitate the acceptance of the plan among an increasing constituency of service organizations/providers throughout the state.
 - 9.3 Regional network participants will engage in inventories and assessments per this plan and develop local/regional objectives and action steps for implementation in future years. Such planning outcomes will be reported to the committee at the end of year one for incorporation into the year-two plan.
-

Appendix A – Overview of the National Service Partners

The national service partners in California are the administrative entities that oversee the programs of the Corporation for National Service. The administrative partners are the California Commission on Improving Life Through Service, the California State Corporation Office, and the California Department of Education. The CNS programs the entities administer are:

Learn and Serve America

- **K–12 School-based Programs** – In California school-based service-learning projects are supported by the CalServe K–12 Service-Learning Initiative under the direction of the California Department of Education (CDE). The initiative provides direct funding to support service-learning, an instructional method by which students improve academic learning and develop personal skills through structured service projects that meet the needs of the community.
- **K–12 Community-based Programs** – Community-based service-learning programs are service-learning programs run by public or private non-profit community-based organizations. Currently, there are no community-based service-learning programs in California.
- **Higher Education** – Higher education service-learning programs incorporate service-learning principles into the curriculum of college and university students. Programs are operated independently by colleges and universities throughout the state.

AmeriCorps*

- **State and National**– AmeriCorps is a national service program established in 1993 which provides thousands of Americans of all ages and backgrounds with an opportunity to commit a year of their lives to serving their communities. AmeriCorps members meet critical needs in the areas of public safety, education, environment, and human needs. In return for their service, AmeriCorps members receive an education award that can be used to pay off college loans or continuing education costs. In California, AmeriCorps*State programs are administered by the California Commission on Improving Life Through Service. All AmeriCorps*National programs are administered directly by the Corporation for National Service.
- **VISTA** – Established in 1965, Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) is a national service program that encourages and enables individuals from all walks of life to help residents of disadvantaged communities to become more self-sufficient. To increase the capability

of people to improve the conditions of their own lives, VISTA members develop, organize, and create employment training, literacy, housing assistance, health education, and neighborhood revitalization programs.

- **National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC)** – AmeriCorps*NCCC is a residential national service program that provides opportunities for young Americans to work in teams to meet critical needs in urban and rural communities throughout the United States. The corps focuses on projects that protect and conserve natural resources, promote public safety, and helps meet the educational and human needs of children, older persons, and others in the community.

National Senior Service Corps

- **Foster Grandparents Program** – The Foster Grandparents Program provides invaluable aid to children and youth with exceptional needs. Foster Grandparents serve twenty hours a week in schools, hospitals, correctional institutions, and Head Start and day care centers. They work one-on-one to help children who have been abused or neglected, mentor troubled teenagers and young mothers, and care for premature infants or children with physical disabilities.
- **Senior Companion Program** – Senior Companions are volunteers age 60 and over who provide assistance and friendship to seniors and other individuals who have difficulty with daily living tasks. The service they provide helps others live independently in their homes instead of moving to expensive institutional care.
- **Retired and Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP)** – RSVP helps individuals age 55 and older put their skills and life experience to work in their communities. RSVP volunteers serve from a few hours to twenty hours a week doing almost anything.

Appendix B – Tier 1 and 2 Committee Members

Tier 1 Committee Members

- Todd Clark – Commission Chair and Executive Director, Constitutional Rights Foundation;
- Florence Newsom – Commission Vice Chair and Executive Director, Los Angeles Girls Scouts Council;
- Linda Forsyth – Executive Director, Commission;
- Alexandra Reid – RSVP Director Area 1;
- Roger Hancock – Vice President, Bank of America;
- Rachel Smith – Executive Director, Youth Service California;
- Mae Chao – Co-Director, CNS State Office;
- Gayle Hawkins – Co-Director, CNS State Office;
- David Muraki – Director of Development, Commission;
- John Oda – Executive Director, California Campus Compact;
- Jeannie Kim-Han – Assistant Director, Community Service Learning, CSU-Fullerton;
- Wade Brynson – Assistant Superintendent, Department of Education;
- Andre Vanier – Commissioner.

Tier 2 Committee Members

- Carol Stone – Executive Director, Volunteer Center of Orange County;
- Virginia Victorin – Program Director, Arco Foundation;
- Walter Hickey – FGP/SCP Project Director, Sonoma Developmental Center;
- Carol Conway – RSVP Director, Life Span Services Network, Inc.;
- Meredith Drake – Program Coordinator, American Red Cross – Los Angeles Chapter;
- Stephani Hardy – Los Angeles Vets;
- Kelly Landau – Director, United Way Volunteer Center;
- Lew Witherspoon – Campus Director, AmeriCorps*NCCC Western Region;
- Jennifer Geagan – World Institute on Disability;
- Dr. Liz Giffen-Glad – Los Angeles Unifies School District;
- Florence Green – Executive Director, California Association of Non-Profits;
- Jeff Hoffman – Manager of the Disney University, The Walt Disney Company.